PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE	rom	the RNATIONAL SEAF	RCHING AUTHO	ORITY		REC'D 26 JA	N 2005		
International Searching Authority (PCT Rule 43bis.1)	To:					P.65			
Applicant's or agent's file reference See form PCT/SAA220 See form PCT/SAA220 See paragraph 2 below International application No. PCT/NL2004/000771 International filing date (day/month/pear) Priority date (day/month/pear) (07.11.2003) International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC F16L37/092, F16L21/03 Applicant BRAAMS, Gustaaf Christiaan Erik 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. II Priority Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VII Certain documents cited Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Certain observations on the international preliminary examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the international Bureau under Rule 65.156(5) that written opinions of this international Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written replive form PCT/SAA220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/SAA220.	see form PCT/ISA/220			INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY					
International application No. PCTNL2004.000771 International filing date (daytmonth/year) 04.11.2004 Priority date (daytmonth/year) 07.11.2003 International patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC F161.37092, F161.21/03 Applicant BRAAMS, Gustaaf Christiaan Erik 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. II Basis of the opinion Box No. III Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinion of the IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.						ee form PCT/ISA/210 (second	sheet)		
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		_			1				
Applicant BRAAMS, Gustaaf Christiaan Erik 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 56.1 bis(b) that written opinion of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/SA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/SA/220.	PC	TNL2004/000771	·	04.11.2004					
BRAAMS, Gustaaf Christiaan Erik 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. I Basis of the opinion □ Box No. II Priority □ Box No. IV Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is Invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.				both national classification	and IPC	,			
 Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. 	• •		Christiaan Erik						
□ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the international Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the international Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this international Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	1.	☐ Box No. I Basis of the opinion							
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the international Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the international Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	•	 □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention ⋈ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial 							
 ☑ Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application ☑ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. 									
 ☑ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. 		☐ Box No. VI							
 FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. 									
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.		⊠ Box No. VIII	Certain observ	ations on the Internatio	nai application		•		
written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.	2.	FURTHER ACT	ION						
submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.	written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 <i>bis</i> (b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority								
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.	submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date,								
	For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.								
	3.	For further detai	For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.						
				٠.					



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Budtz-Olsen, A

Telephone No. +31 70 340-3566



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/NL2004/000771

	Box N	o. I Basis of the opinion				
1.	With re	egard to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in guage in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.				
	laı	is opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following nguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search nder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).				
2.	. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
	a. type	of material:				
		a sequence listing				
		table(s) related to the sequence listing				
b. format of material:						
		in written format				
		in computer readable form				
	c. time	of filing/furnishing:				
		contained in the international application as filed.				
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.				
_		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.				
3.	h: Co	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as opropriate, were furnished.				
4.	Addition	onal comments:				

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/NL2004/000771

	Вох	(No. II	Priority						
1.	Ø	The fo	llowing document ha	s not bee	n furnished	l:			
			copy of the earlier	application	whose pri	ority has bee	en claimed (R	ule 43 <i>bis</i> .1 a	and 66.7(a)).
			translation of the ea	arlier appl	cation who	se priority ha	as been claim	ed (Rule 43	bis.1 and 66.7(b)).
		Conse	quently it has not be heless been establis	en possib hed on th	le to conside assumpti	der the validit on that the re	ty of the priori elevant date i	ty claim. This the claimed	s opinion has d priority date.
2.	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.								
3.	It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.								
4.	Ado	ditional (observations, if nece	ssary:					
	Bo	x No. V ustrial	Reasoned states	ment und	er Rule 43 explanation	<i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) w ns supportir	ith regard to ng such state	novelty, inv ement	ventive step or
1		tement	-,,			•			
٠.	Ola	CHICH							
	No	velty (N) .	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-26			
			•	NO.	Ciaiiiis				·
	Inventive step (IS)		Yes:	Claims	1-25				
			·	No:	Claims	26			• *
	Ind	ustrial a	applicability (IA)	Yes:	Claims	1-26			
				No:	Claims				
_	.		. A						
2.	Citi	ations a	nd explanations						
-	see	separ	ate sheet					•	•
_	Bo	x No. V	II Certain defects	in the in	ternationa	l application	1		
_									

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/NL2004/000771

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

PCT/NL2004/000771

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- The following documents are referred to in this communication:D1: US 4 205 424 A (NAGAO SHOZO ET AL) 3 June 1980 (1980-06-03)
- 2. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 26
- 2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 26 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.
- 2.2 The document D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 26, and discloses (see figures 1 and 4):
 - A system comprising two tubes (1,2) and a clamping ring (3) for attaching one tube (1) coaxially around the other rigid tube (2) by means of clamping, which clamping ring (3) can assume at least a first and a second position, the clamping ring (3) being provided with at least one substantially ring shaped part virtually closed in itself, wherein the clamping ring (3) is further provided with a segment (9) movable relative to the ring-shaped part, connected to ends of the ring-shaped part, while in the first position, the clamping ring (3) substantially has the shape of a ring and in the second position, the segment (9) is located inwards relative to the ring-shaped part such that each diameter of the clamping ring (3) in the second position is smaller than each diameter of the clamping ring (3) in the first position.
- 2.3 The only difference between the subject-matter of claim 26 and the system known from D1 is that the outer tube of the application is flexible whereas the outer tube of D1 is rigid. This feature is however irrelevant to the functioning of clamping sleeve.

Consequently, the solution proposed in claim 26 therefore cannot be considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

- 3. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1 AND 25
- 3.1 Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses a flexible clamping ring used in the connection of two cylindrical parts.

From this, the subject-matter of independent claim 1 differs in that:

The clamping ring has at least a local increases in its flexibility relative to the flexibility of the rest of the ring, and therefore the segment can move between a first and a second state.

- 3.2 The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT)
- 3.3. The problem to be solved by the present invention may be regarded as:

The possibility to define the place of the moveable segment.

3.4 The solution to this problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons:

The clamping ring of D1 is made of a material with constant flexibility, and therefore the place of the movable segment can not be defined.

- 3.5 The subject-matter of claim 1 therefore involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT)
- 3.6 The subject-matter of claim 25 is also novel and inventive for the same reasoning mutatis mutandis as for claim 1.

- 4. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2 24
- 4.1 Claims 2-24 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.

Re Item VII

Certain defects in the international application

- 1. The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT).
- 2. Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in the document D1 is not mentioned in the description, nor is this document identified therein.
- 3. Based on D1 the two-part form of claim 1 is not correct. Only the "movability of the segment" (lines 11-14) is not disclosed.

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

1. For reasons of clarity the word "position" used in the description and claims should be substituted with "state".